

Subject: Re: CPRA request (LAATTY.2019.08.04.a)
From: [REDACTED]
Date: 8/15/19, 3:06 PM
To: "Bethelwel Wilson" <bethelwel.wilson@lacity.org>

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I hope you will save us all some time and clarify your exemption claims further by answering the following questions:

0. When you say these letters are exempt via sections 6254(f), 6254(k), AND 6255, do you mean that each section applies to each letter, or that each letter is exempted by one or more of those sections, or something else?

1. I can't imagine any way in which 6254(f) could apply. Presumably these letters are issued as the result of an investigation, but they are not part of an investigation. I hope you will enlighten me.

2. Can you tell me which privilege or privilege covered by 6254(k) you are invoking here?

3. Can you tell me what conception of the public interest in releasing these records is *clearly* outweighed by the public interest in withholding them, and what the public interest in withholding them might be? I know you must have carried out this weighing test as it's required by law before using 6255(a) to withhold records, so there can't be any harm in sharing it now.

Finally, I will consider your offer as to the list. I thought I was saving us all some time by asking for a list, but evidently that's not so easily done.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

On Thu, Aug 15, 2019, at 2:57 PM, Bethelwel Wilson wrote:

Good Afternoon [REDACTED]

In response to your request for nuisance abatement letters sent out by the CA in 2018 and 2019, please find attached three copies of nuisance abatement letters related to 3420 W. Slauson Avenue. The City generally withholds nuisance abatement letters as exempt from disclosure under Government Code sections 6254(f), 6254(k), and 6255. The City recently released said correspondence to the Los Angeles Times under exceptional circumstance -